

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 and 5-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5-7 and 9 are amended. No new matter is added.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Specifically, it is alleged that there is insufficient support in the specification for the recited feature of "a first data source connected to an input/output interface of the first database" and "the second database is connected to an input/output interface of the first database".

The specification and figures are replete with support for the claimed features. For example, as shown in Fig. 5, data sources 700 are connected to the input/output interface 605 through the link 705. Such data sources may correspond to data sources 111 through 116, as well as data sources 121 through 125 and 131. The data provided by such data sources is described throughout the specification. Additionally, as shown in Fig. 1, such data sources are connected to databases 110, 120 and 130. The airline databases 120 and 130 are also connected to the airport management database 110. Accordingly, such connections would go through an input/output device such as that shown in Fig. 5. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,913,912 to Nishimura et al. (Nishimura). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nishimura fails to disclose each and every feature recited in the rejected claims, as amended. For example, Nishimura fails to disclose an airport operations managing system that provides decision support for airport operations, comprising: an airport management database networked with a first data source usable to obtain and store publicly available status information on the status of airport operations; at least one airline database networked with a second data source usable to obtain and store shared airline status information of airline activities, the at least one airline database is networked with the airport management database for exchanging the publicly available status information and the shared airline status information; a first airport operations advisor module having at least one of a graphical user interface and a text based interface and usable to manage airport operations, wherein the first airport operations advisor is networked with at least the airport management database to receive at least one of the publicly available status information and the shared airline status information, wherein the publicly available status information and the shared airline status information is accessible by airport management for managing operations of an airport; and at least one second airport operations advisor module having at least one of a graphical user interface and a text based interface and usable to manage airline operations, wherein the at least one second airport operations advisor is networked with the airport management database to receive the publicly available status information and the shared airline status information, as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, Nishimura fails to disclose an airport operations managing system that provides decision support for airport operations, comprising: a first data source that provides

publicly available airport status information to an airport management database, wherein the first data source is connected to an input/output interface of the airport management database; a second data source that provides shared airline status information to an airline database, wherein the airline database is connected to the input/output interface of the airport management database; a memory connected to the input/output interface of the airport management database via a data bus for storing the publicly available status information and the shared airline status information; a display connected to the input/output interface of the airport management database for viewing the publicly available status information and the shared airline status information from the first and the second data source; an input device connected to the input/output interface of the airport management database for inputting user commands to the airport operations managing system based on the publicly available status information and the shared airline status information; and a controller connected to the input/output interface of the airport management database to control the movement of data within the airport operations managing system, as recited in claim 7.

Nishimura also fails to disclose a method of providing decision support for airport operations, comprising: gathering status information on an aircraft and an airport from at least one data source and storing the status information in a common decision support database accessible by airport management and an airline; distributing the status information to a display at an airport operations center; reviewing the status information on the display to identify current status of aircraft and airport operations; and implementing a response based on the status information, as recited in claim 10.

Finally, Nishimura fails to disclose a storage medium storing a set of program instructions executable on a data processing device and usable to provide decision support for airport operations, the set of program instructions comprising: instructions for gathering status information on an aircraft and an airport from at least one data source and storing the

status information in a common decision support database accessible by airport management and an airline; instructions for distributing the status information to a display at an airport operations center; instructions for reviewing the status information on the display to identify current status of aircraft and airport operations; and instructions for implementing a response based on the status information, as recited in claim 16.

Nishimura relates to a flight strips management method and system for rationalizing management of movement of aircraft at an airport (col. 1, lines 7-9). An object of Nishimura is to provide systems and methods whereby an operator can easily ascertain the condition of all aircraft in an airport and aircraft management functions can be performed in an optimal way (col. 1, lines 57-60).

The method and system of Nishimura is implemented as shown in Figs. 1 and 2, for example. As shown in Fig. 1, a plurality of information processing devices such as 10a and 10b are provided. These processing devices process flight information and control information, that are stored in databases 11 and 12, respectively. The processing device 10a specifically processes flight information, such as aircraft condition information and/or gate allocation information for each aircraft (col. 4, lines 10-12). Processing device 10b is a control information processing device that processes control information of the airfield (col. 4, lines 12-15).

Additional processing devices process information such as service information relating to servicing an aircraft (10c), spot management information such as takeoff/landing spots for takeoff/landing of an aircraft on a runway (10d), gate allocation information whereby a gate is allocated and connected to an embarkation hatch when an aircraft makes use of an embarkation hatch (10e), and check-in booking system information relating to check-in and/or booking of passengers (10f). Thus, none of the information processing devices or their related databases correspond to an airport management database networked

with a first data source usable to obtain and store publicly available status information on the status of airport operations, or at least one airline database networked with a second data source usable to obtain and store shared airline status information of airline activities, the at least one airline database networked with the airport management database for exchanging publicly available status information and shared airline status information.

Additionally, none of the information processing devices 10a-10f, or their related databases 11-16, correspond to the first or second airport operations advisor modules recited in rejected claims 1 and 3. For example, the Office Action alleges that the control information processing device 10b corresponds to the at least one second airport operations advisor module recited in claims 1 and 3. However, the control information processing device 10b is specifically defined as processing control information of the airfield at col. 4, lines 13-15. Thus, such a processing device does not correspond to an airport operation advisor module usable to manage airline operations wherein the airport operation advisor module is networked with the airport management database to receive publicly available status information in the shared airline status information.

As Nishimura fails to disclose each and every feature recited in the rejected claims, as amended, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5 and 7-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nishimura in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,278,965 to Glass et al. (Glass); and claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nishimura. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 and 17 are allowable for their dependency on independent claim 1 for the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features recited therein. Furthermore,

as Glass fails to overcome the deficiencies of Nishimura regarding the rejection of claim 6, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3 and 5-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John W. Fitzpatrick
Registration No. 41,018

JAO:JWF/lbg

Date: June 30, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461